DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 169 107 TM 008 536

AUTHOR Gray, Peter J.
TITLE A Technology for Program Documentation and Evaluation: A Pilot Meta-Evaluation.
PUB DATE Mar 78
NOTE 30p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (62nd, Toronto, Ontario, Canada, March 27-31, 1978); last page has been removed due to marginal legibility of original document

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Documentation; Elementary Secondary Education; Evaluation Criteria; *Evaluation Methods; Higher Education; *Pilot Projects; *Program Descriptions; Program Development; *Program Planning
IDENTIFIERS *Meta Evaluation

ABSTRACT

Meta evaluation, or the evaluation of evaluations, was applied to a technology for program documentation and evaluation used in a mainstreaming project. The technology consisted of four phases: (1) planning for decision-making; (2) documenting actual program outcomes; (3) implementing decisions; and (4) instituting program renewal. This pilot meta evaluation focused only upon the planning board and detail file tasks of phase 1. These tasks formed a plan for day-to-day project management. The eight people involved in the development of the planning board and detail file were questioned regarding implementation, quality, and use. The pilot meta evaluation methods were generally considered to be clear, thorough, and appropriate; however, several modifications for full-scale meta evaluation were suggested. (CP)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED169107

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

A TECHNOLOGY FOR PROGRAM DOCUMENTATION AND EVALUATION: A PILOT META-EVALUATION

by

Peter J. Gray

Coordinator
Evaluation Component
Dean's Project on
Mainstreaming

College of Education
University of Oregon
Eugene, Oregon

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Peter J. Gray

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

A paper presented at the
Annual Meeting of the
American Educational Research Association
March, 1978, in Toronto, Ontario, Canada

Session 33.10

TM008 536

Meta-evaluation or the evaluation of evaluations is a relatively new concept in education (Scriven, 1969; Stufflebeam, 1974). However, in light of the resources being expended on evaluation in all its forms at the national, state and local levels, meta-evaluation is an idea whose time has come.

Stufflebeam has written the classic monograph on meta-evaluation (1974). In it, he notes, "The topic of meta-evaluation is timely, because evaluators increasingly are being required to evaluate their work" (Stufflebeam, 1974, p. 3). That is, "Evaluators have come under much pressure to insure and demonstrate they are doing quality work" (p. 3). However, commenting on the current development of meta-evaluation, Stufflebeam says, "Discussions of the logical structure of meta-evaluation have been cryptic and have appeared in only a few fugitive papers...Overall, the state of the art of meta-evaluations is primitive and there is a need for both conceptual and technical development of the area" (1974, p. 4-5).

Based on Stufflebeam's comments, two problems were conceived which provided the direction for this study. The first problem was to assess the quality of an evaluation design which was currently in use. In order to do this a second problem had to be addressed, namely, the development and testing of a set of meta-evaluation methods. To solve the stated problems, the pilot meta-evaluation study reported here was designed and implemented.

The author wishes to thank Dr. Diane Reinhard and Dr. Richard Rankin for their critical reading of this manuscript.

The primary evaluation which was the focus of this study is called a technology for program documentation and evaluation. This was a pilot study since, by design, only part of the technology was assessed in a limited way in order to lay the ground work for a more comprehensive meta-evaluation to come.

The context for both the primary and the meta-evaluation was the Dean's Project on Mainstreaming at the University of Oregon.[1] After two planning years, the Dean's Project is in its first of three implementation years. 1977-1978 is also the first year that the technology has been used to document and evaluate the project. Therefore, it was appropriate to carry out a pilot meta-evaluation of the initial steps of the technology. In this way, the quality of the primary evaluation's techniques was assessed in regard to both their implementation and results, and a field test of the meta-evaluation methods was accomplished.

Figure 1 illustrates the conceptual framework of this study. On level one is the primary evaluation, in this case, the planning board and detail file tasks of the technology for program documentation and evaluation. The meta-evaluation designs, objects, and methods are on level two. In this study, an open-ended questionnaire and interview were used to assess the implementation of the planning board and detail file as specified by Stufflebeam's proactive meta-evaluation design number three. A fixed response questionnaire was the primary method used to assess the quality and use of the planning board and detail file. A follow-up interview provided project personnel with an opportunity to elaborate on or explain their responses. Assessment of quality and use is the aim of Stufflebeam's proactive meta-evaluation design number four. On level three is the assessment of the

Figure 1: The Conceptual Framework

Assessment of Meta-Evaluation Methods	A field-test of the methods to determine their clarity, thoroughness and appropriateness for use in future meta-evaluations.		Level 3
Meta-Evaluation			Level 2
Designs	Proactive Design #3	Proactive Design #4	
Objects	Implementation	Results	
Methods	Open-ended questionnaire, interview	Fixed-response questionnaire, interview	
Primary Evaluation	Planning board and detail file tasks of the Technology for Program Documentation and Evaluation		Level 1
Context	Dean's Project on Mainstreaming		

meta-evaluation methods. An interview format was used to gather information of the methods' clarity, thoroughness and appropriateness for use in future studies. This last level was included since this was a pilot study.

The rest of this paper is divided into three sections. The first of these sections contains a description of the technology for program documentation and evaluation. In the second section, the technical framework for the study is discussed. The study's results are described and discussed in the third section.

The Technology for Program Documentation and Evaluation

The summary shown in Figure 2 lists the four phases and the major steps of the technology for program documentation and evaluation. In addition, the two tasks of the program description step, creating a planning board and developing a detail file, are listed since these were the specific focus of the pilot meta-evaluation. These two tasks, as conceptualized here, are unique to the documentation and evaluation technology.

The planning board format shown in Figure 3 is based on Hammond's program blueprint (1975, in press). In turn, Hammond's program blueprint is based on Lewin's (1951) statement that:

> "In principle it is everywhere accepted that behavior (B) is a function of the person (P) and environment (E). B = f (P,E), and (P) and (E) in this formula are interdependent variables" (p. 25).

In the planning board format, the person (P) variable is defined in terms of the clients, staff, and administration of a program, that is, the people who make up the program; these elements are placed on the horizontal axis of the planning board format shown in Figure 3. The environment (E)

variable is defined in terms of program goals, activities and resources, that is, the context created by the program; these elements are placed on the vertical axis of the planning board format shown in Figure 3. The combination of each horizontal element with each vertical element constitutes the program's specifications (e.g., Client-Goals, cell 1; Staff-Activities, cell 5; Administration-Resources, cell 9).

The planning board for the inservice component of the Dean's Project is included in the Appendix. A planning board similar to this one was developed for each of the Dean's Project's six components: elementary education, secondary education, five-year program, inservice, evaluation, and dissemination.

The purpose of the planning board is to provide program administrators, including the project evaluator, with a road map of each component. Based on this road map, day-to-day management of the project may be carried out and relevant evaluation questions may be posed. In a broad sense, the program specifications shown on the face of the planning board are the behaviors specified in Lewin's formula $B = f(P,E)$.

Of course, not all of the information relating to a component fits into the small cells on the face of the planning board. To provide additional space for a more complete description of the goals, activities, and resources of the program's clients, staff and administration, a detail file for each cell is established. An example of a detail is included in the Appendix. This detail lists all the steps to be taken in designing and carrying out the school district personnel inservice (Staff-Activity Detail 1).

Each of the other steps in the technology is made up of similarly specific tasks as those in the program description step. However, since the

Figure 2: Summary of the Technology for Program Documentation and Evaluation

I. Plan for Decision Making

- A. Describe the program
  1. create a planning board
  2. develop a detail file
- B. Establish a documentation and evaluation time line
- C. Generate evaluation questions
- D. Specify decision rules
- E. Develop documentation techniques and instruments

II. Document Actual Program Outcomes

- A. Collect and analyze data
- B. Generate documentation reports

III. Carry out Decision Making

- A. Review documentation reports
- B. Apply decision rules
- C. Document decisions made

IV. Institute Program Renewal

- A. Modify program to reflect decisions
- B. Update detail file

Figure 3: Planning Board Format

	PEOPLE		
Cell Logic: People + Context = Program Specifications	Client Definition: Those people who receive the benefits of the program.	Staff Definition: Those people responsible for designing and implementing the program.	Administration Definition: Those people responsible for organizing and directing the program.
CONTEXT Goals: Statements representing the ends toward which clients, staff, and administration are directed.	Client-Goals cell 1	Staff-Goals cell 4	Administration-Goals cell 7
Activities: Statements representing courses of action established to achieve program goals	Client-Activities cell 2	Staff-Activities cell 5	Administration-Activities cell 8
Resources: Statements representing necessary Human, Time, and Material allocations.	Client-Resources cell 3	Staff-Resources cell 6	Administration-Resources cell 9

pilot meta-evaluation reported here focused on the planning board and detail file aspects of the technology, only a brief description of the main steps in the rest of the technology is provided.

Once the program administrator(s) and the evaluator agree that the program has been adequately described, a time line for carrying out the documentation and evaluation is established. The time line should coincide with the natural cycle of the program. In this way the program renewal phase will occur as the program is entering its next planning phase in preparation for subsequent implementation. In educational settings, program renewal usually occurs in the Spring and/or Summer, with implementation in the Fall.

The generation of evaluation questions is the second most critical step in planning for decision-making. In this step, choices are made as to which of the multitude of decision situations appearing in the planning board and detail file will be documented and evaluated.

Once the important evaluation questions have been generated, decision rules for making judgments must be specified. Decision rules include the decision-making authority, and decision alternatives, the conditions for accomplishment, and standards of excellence particular to each decision situation. Also based on the evaluation questions will be the development of documentation and evaluation techniques and instruments. The specific tasks for this step are common to a number of evaluation models (e.g., Renzulli, 1975; TenBrink, 1974; Provus, 1969; Stufflebeam et al, 1971; Stake, 1967).

Phase two of the technology and implementation of a program go hand in hand, since this phase concentrates on the documentation of actual program outcomes. Depending on the nature of the evaluation questions, the

process, products, or resources of a program may be the subject of documentation. In the technology, actual program outcomes are defined in the broadest sense to include all aspects of a program. The documentation of outcomes is accomplished through the collection and analysis of data and the generation of documentation reports. It is at this point that the various components of the decision rules are first brought to bear. For example, data analysis should be carried out to provide information which is consistent with the conditions and standards specified in the decision rules. In addition, documentation reports should be tailored in terms of their narrative, statistical and graphic presentation to satisfy the information needs of different decision-making authorities (Renzulli, 1975).

Carrying out decision-making, phase three, is the heart of the evaluative process embodied in the technology. This phase consists of reviewing documentation reports, applying decision rules and documenting decisions made. That is, the judgments that will determine the character and fate of the program are made during the decision-making phase.

Instituting program renewal is the fourth phase of the technology. This phase begins a new cycle for the program since its tasks stress the modification of the program to reflect the decisions made. These changes appear in the updated planning board and detail file. Once modifications are completed, a new documentation and evaluation time line is established, new evaluation questions are generated, and the whole process begins again.

The technology just described has the potential for making a significant contribution to educational evaluation because of its comprehensive and thorough nature. However, before it can be wholeheartedly recommended, it must be thoroughly assessed. To begin this assessment, the pilot meta-evaluation to be described next was designed and implemented.

Technical Framework

The technical framework for this study is described in this section under two headings; designsand methods.

Designs

The technical framework for the pilot meta-evaluation was based on two designs described by Stufflebeam (1974). One is proactive meta-evaluation design number three. This design is aimed at the "assessment of the implementation of a chosen evaluation design" (p. 84). The other design used, proactive design number four, is aimed at the "assessment of the quality and use of evaluation results" (p. 88). These two designs were selected to guide the pilot meta-evaluation since, in a conscious effort to limit the assessment of the technology, the goals and design of the primary evaluation were treated as givens. In the full scale meta-evaluation of the entire technology, all of Stufflebeam's designs will be used to assess the goals, designs, implementation, and results of each task in the technology.

Proactive meta-evaluation design number three has the following purposes:

1. to explicate the operational characteristics of the chosen evaluation design;
2. to project the potential problems in the implementation of the design (Stufflebeam, 1974, p. 84).

In accomplishing its purposes, design number three provides two kinds of feedback. First, it provides a log of the actual process of the technology. Second, implementing this design leads to the identification of problems and recommendations for improving the evaluation activities of the technology (Stufflebeam, 1974, p. 87).

The purpose of proactive meta-evaluation number four is to "enhance the quality and use of evaluation results" (Stufflebeam, 1974, p. 88). Three

tasks are necessary for the implementation of design number four:

> The evaluation objectives should be noted; the meta-evaluation criteria of technical adequacy, utility, and cost/effectiveness should be spelled out in relation to the evaluation objectives; and the intended users of the primary evaluation results should be designated (Stufflebeam, 1974, p. 88).

In accomplishing its purposes, design number four provides feedback on the effectiveness of a given evaluation.

The assessment of the meta-evaluation methods was guided by the following objectives:

(1) to determine the clarity of the meta-evaluation methods

(2) to determine the thoroughness of the meta-evaluation methods

(3) to determine the appropriateness of the methods for use in the full scale meta-evaluation of the entire technology.

The most apparent source of data on the planning board and detail file was the project personnel who participated in the description of each component. Once these people had assessed the program description step of the technology, they were the obvious choice for the assessment of the pilot meta-evaluation techniques and instruments as well. There were eight people in all who took part in this study; while the number of subjects is small it should be noted that all of the project personnel who were involved in the development of the component planning boards and detail files are included.

Methods

As Stufflebeam (1974) notes, "in practice there are many instances of meta-evaluation that check on and guide the implementation of evaluation designs. Largely, these pertain to self-assessment activities...." (p. 87). An important point to remember is that each evaluation design is unique and, therefore, a meta-evaluation must be tailored to fit its unique char-

acteristics. However, the meta-evaluation designs proposed by Stufflebeam provide a common basis for evaluating many different types of evaluations.

Three methods were used in the pilot meta-evaluation reported here. One method was an open-ended questionnaire created to assess the implementation of the planning board and detail file. This type of assessment was the aim of proactive design number three. The open-ended questionnaire form is shown in the Appendix. The items on this form were written to elicit information about the positive and negative aspects of the planning board and detail file tasks and to elicit recommendations for their improvement.

The second meta-evaluation method was a fixed-response questionnaire. This form was designed to assess the quality and use of the planning board and detail file (see Appendix). As suggested by proactive design number four, the items on the questionnaire were based on Stufflebeam's meta-evaluation standards and criteria. Each criteria was first stated and then it was translated into a statement referring to the planning board and detail file. These statements were intended to present the objectives of the planning board and detail file for consideration. An agree-disagree continuum was attached to each statement to fix the range of possible responses in order to facilitate interpretation of this questionnaire's results.

The third meta-evaluation method, an interview with each person who completed the questionnaire forms, had a number of purposes. First, it was intended to gather more information on the implementation of the planning board and detail file than was collected by the open-ended questionnaire. In this regard, a cover letter accompanying the questionnaire forms told the project personnel that comments regarding my performance as an evaluator in developing the planning board and detail file would be welcomed during

the interview. The interview allowed project personnel an opportunity to elaborate on their responses to the questionnaire forms in general and to clear up any specific problems that they had in responding to the forms. It also gave the evaluator information relative to the meta-evaluation methods themselves. The meta-evaluation methods assessment form, shown in the Appendix, guided this particular aspect of the interview.

Results and Discussion

In this section the results of the study will be reported and discussed in the following sequence. First, the results regarding the implementation of the planning board and detail file tasks will be listed and commented on. Second, the results regarding the quality and use of the planning boards and detail files will be summarized and discussed. Third, the results of the assessment of the meta-evaluation methods will be related and conclusions will be drawn which will guide future meta-evaluations.

The open-ended questionnaire stimulated some insightful statements by respondents. The purposes of proactive meta-evaluation design number three seems to have been especially well met through the use of the open-ended questionnaire. For example, the following statements helped to explicate the operational characteristics of the planning board and detail file:

- summarizes and forces a verbalization of what is to be accomplished. Good for show and tell.
- a visual representation of progress is helpful.
- precise statements of goals, actions.
- provides supportive data on the degree to which projected plans were actually carried out and the process for doing it.

Problems in the planning board and detail file were also pointed out as is

shown in the following statements:

- since the project is developmental, components change considerably over time. This requires continuous adjustment.
- could be interpreted as simple and mechanistic.
- educatorese, overly complicated at times, overwhelming details.

Some excellent recommendations were also made, including the following:

- can you simplify it and remove some "buzz" words known only to a few?
- make them more visible or accessible, to all faculty, e.g., hang in a central location for easy reference.
- some files need more information, e.g., timelines, who is responsible for activities.

Additional feedback on the implementation of the planning board and detail file was also gathered during the interview. Recommendations for improvement that were made, such as providing a brief description of each task in layman's terms and making sure that the component personnel see the relevance of the evaluation effort to their day to day management responsibilities, will become part of the subsequent implementation of the other tasks in the technology.

As is evident from Table 1, the fixed-response questionnaire ratings of the planning board and detail file were consistently positive. This is true in regard to their technical adequacy (item 1-4, average rating = 4.65), utility (items 5-10, average rating = 4.83), and efficiency (item 11, average rating = 4.78). In fact, a majority of the items (i.e., 8 out of 11) were given a moderately agree (5) or strongly agree (6) rating by half or more of the respondents. This indicates consistently high agreement as to the quality and use of the planning board and detail file.

Table 1: Frequency of Agree-Disagree Ratings of the Planning Board and Detail File and Average Ratings for Each Meta-Evaluation Standard and Criteria

	Frequency of Agree-Disagree Ratings						Average Ratings Standards and Criteria
	Strongly Agree 6	5	Agree 4	Disagree 3	2	Strongly Disagree 1	
A. Technical Adequacy							4.65
1. internally valid	1	6	1	-	-	-	5.00
2. externally valid	1	5	2	-	-	-	4.87
3. reliable	1	6	-	1	-	-	4.87
4. objective	2	1	1	2	2	-	3.87
B. Utility							4.83
5. relevant	2	4	2	-	-	-	5.00
6. important	2	4	1	1	-	-	4.87
7. scope	1	2	5	-	-	-	4.50
8. credible	1	6	1	-	-	-	5.00
9. timely	1	2	2	1	-	-	4.50 *
10. pervasive	3	4	-	1	-	-	5.12
C. Efficiency							4.78
11. cost/effectiveness	2	3	- 1	1	-	-	4.78 **

* two respondents gave the detail file a 5 and the planning board a 2
** one person left this item blank, another put a mark between the 4 and 3

n = 8, except as noted above

Two technical adequacy criteria received disagree ratings which were investigated in subsequent interviews. In the case of the objectivity criteria, it became apparent that, because of the sophisticated nature of the program description step's planning board and detail file, component personnel felt that it might be difficult for another evaluator to use this design to describe their component. This presents quite a different perspective than if the planning board and detail file had been found to be biased evaluation tools. In other words, the results of the evaluation process were found to be technically adequate and the process itself was judged to have been effective. However, the exportability of the design, on which the process and results were based, was questioned. Currently, the technology is being translated into a workshop format to help other evaluators learn how to correctly use it.

One disagree rating was recorded for the technical adequacy criteria "reliable." This rating, it turned out, was quite straightforward. The interview revealed that in one component there was some misinformation in the planning board and detail file. This misinformation concerned the steps to be taken in carrying out the component's action plan. The interview provided an opportunity to clear up the problem and the appropriate corrections were made in the planning board and detail file.

The interviews which followed-up on the fixed-response questionnaire revealed that the negative ratings on some of the utility criteria had two causes. In one case, the purpose of the planning board and detail file had not been clearly communicated. The importance of clearly stating an evaluation design's objective is stressed in proactive meta-evaluation design number four. It was not apparent to some project personnel that the planning

board and detail file were intended to describe their components for evaluation and to guide the day to day operation of their component as well. If this distinction was apparent then, to some, their pre-existing action plan was more important, timely or pervasive because of its familiarity. It is anticipated that utility will increase as a result of this year's worth of work with the planning board and detail file and as a result of the revision of these products in preparation for the next cycle of the project.

Two people chose to split their rating of the planning board and detail file in regard to their timeliness. They suggested that each task in the technology might best be assessed separately. In preparation for the meta-evaluation of the entire technology the tasks under each step will be examined to determine if they should be assessed separately or as a group.

The negative, equivocal and blank responses to the efficiency item, cost/effectiveness, caused concern. The interview revealed that, in fact, one person did not see the need to spend so much time getting all the information for the planning board and detail file. Others felt it was too early in the evaluation process to determine cost/effectiveness. Therefore, the real fruits of the planning board and detail file will not be realized until decisions are made. At that point it may be determined whether the results of the evaluation effort were worth its costs.

In summary, the findings of the pilot meta-evaluation showed that both the implementation and results of the planning board and detail file tasks were of high quality. Based on these findings, the component planning boards and detail files should be useful in guiding the rest of the technology.

The results of the assessment of the meta-evaluation methods will be considered next. All eight respondents found the open-ended questionnaire form to be clear and thorough. All eight respondents also felt that the

open-ended questionnaire form and the interview were appropriate for use in future meta-evaluations. Five out of eight respondents judged the fixed-response questionnaire to be clear, thorough and appropriate.

The pilot meta-evaluation methods were generally considered to be clear, thorough, and appropriate. However, looking back on the discussions which took place in the interviews, it is reasonable to suggest that some modifications should be made in preparation for the full-scale meta-evaluation of the entire technology.

The following five conclusions summarize the modifications that were suggested by this study's results. First, a decision must be made in advance whether or not to assess each task in the technology separately. This will ensure unequivocal feedback as to the tasks' worth. Second, in the full-scale meta-evaluation, the technology's tasks will be assessed in terms of all the meta-evaluation objects, i.e., goals, designs, processes and results (Stufflebeam, 1974). Therefore, all of the meta-evaluation designs described by Stufflebeam will be used. Third, perhaps different people should assess different aspects of the technology's worth. For example, a panel of experts might be the appropriate judge of the technology's technical adequacy. The project personnel might be the best judges of its utility and the project management team might best judge its cost/effectiveness. Fourth, there seems to be a systematic difference in the way component personnel view the technology's utility. The use of a case study to explicate the relationship between the value placed on the technology and specific component characteristics might provide information which can be used to facilitate acceptance of the technology. This information could also facilitate the prediction of the technology's success in other projects. Fifth,

the combination of open-ended, fixed-response, interview, and case study formats should be used in assessing the technology. This will result in the collection of rich, qualitative, observational data and hard, generalizable, survey data. Both types of data are important for determining the success of the technology in the context of the Dean's Project and for assessing the technology's potential for use in other projects.

The results of this study will have two types of impact on the evaluation component of the Dean's Project on Mainstreaming. First, the recommendations for improving the technology will be incorporated into the day to day evaluation activities. Second, the recommendations for improving the meta-evaluation methods will be incorporated into the development and implementation of the full-scale meta-evaluation of the entire technology.

It is hoped that this study and the meta-evaluation to come also make a contribution to the literature on evaluation in the following ways: (1) through the description of a tested evaluation design in the form of the technology for program documentation and evaluation; and (2) as examples of meta-evaluation methodology and practice.

Footnote

1. The following description of the Dean's Project was excerpted from a presentation made to The Council for Exceptional Children International Convention in Atlanta in 1977 by Dr. Greg Weisenstein of the College of Education at the University of Oregon. Inquiries about the Dean's Project should be directed to Dr. Weisenstein.

The Bureau of Education for the Handicapped, U.S.O.E., has helped stimulate restructuring of teacher preparation programs by making available competitive grant awards to colleges and universities. Deans' Grants, as they have been labeled,are intended to encourage the development of training programs to increase, especially at the preservice level, the capabilities of regular education teachers to accommodate mainstreamed students. This funding received by approximately 70 major colleges and universities has served to create an environment which is promoting a rapprochement between special and regular education faculties.

Receipt of the Dean's Grant from the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped has enabled the University of Oregon to accelerate the process of integrating the special and regular education programs. The goals of the Oregon Dean's Project is to provide specialized preparation for all students majoring in education at the undergraduate level. Two options are currently being planned and implemented. First, students may opt for basic certification in elementary or secondary education which incorporates work in such specialized areas as diagnosis and instructional prescription, classroom management, and characteristics of exceptional children. This option prepares the graduate to teach in a regular classroom or a regular classroom with a limited number of exceptional children (i.e., mainstreamed classroom). The second option includes basic certification in elementary and secondary education with concurrent endorsement to teach mildly handicapped children. Students trained in this manner will be capable of teaching in a regular classroom, a mainstreamed classroom, or a self-contained special education classroom.

In either option, the special education components of the program would be infused into the regular education course of study. This is to be accomplished through planned curriculum revisions which stress the process of teaching, especially those processes identified as essential to successful mainstreaming. Revisions being made are data-based and related to a carefully conducted goals and objectives analysis of existing training programs at the University of Oregon. In almost all cases, components of the special and regular training programs are being meshed at the course objectives level. New courses to replace or complement current course work and existing course revisions are planned. These changes have implied that new roles will need to be assumed by some faculty, such as teaming approaches, which utilize the strengths of faculty in both special education and regular education. While the University of Oregon Dean's Project is only in the beginning stages of implementation, the extensive planning which has taken place in this project is characteristic of the sweeping changes in teacher preparation which are resulting from the mainstreaming movement.

References

Gray, P.J. Theory into practice: Developing program and documentation blueprints. In P.J. Gray (Ed.), Program documentation and evaluation. Bellingham, Washington: Far West Teacher Corps Network, in press.

Hammond, R.L. Priorities for evaluating programs. Community Education, 1975, 5, 13-16.

Hammond, R.L. Principles and procedures of documentation and evaluation. In P.J. Gray (Ed.), Program documentation and evaluation. Bellingham, Washington: Far West Teacher Corps Network, in press.

Lewin, K. Field theory in social sciences. Darwin Cartwright (Ed.), New York: Harper, 1951.

Provus, M.M. Evaluation of ongoing programs in the public school system. In R.W. Tyler (Ed.), Educational evaluation: New roles, new means. The 68th Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Part II. Chicago: National Society for the Study of Education, 1969.

Renzulli, J.S. Working draft: A guidebook for evaluating programs for the gifted and talented. Ventura, California: Office of the Ventura County Superintendent of Schools, 1975.

Scriven, M. An introduction to meta-evaluation. Educational Product Report, 1969, 2, 36-38.

Stake, R.E. The countenance of educational evaluation. Teachers College Record. 1967, 68, 523-540.

Stufflebeam, D.L., Foley, W.J., Gephart, W.J., Guba, E.G., Hammond, R.L., Merriam, H.O. and Provus, M.M. Educational evaluation and decision-making in education. Ithasca, Illinois: Peacock, 1971.

Stufflebeam, D.L. Meta-evaluation: The Occasional Paper Series. Kalamazoo, Michigan: The Evaluation Center, College of Education, Western Michigan University, 1974.

TenBrink, T.D. Evaluation: A practical guide for teachers. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1974.

Appendix

Contents:

A Planning Board for the Inservice Component

Staff Activity Detail 1

Open-ended Questionnaire Form

Fixed-response Questionnaire Form

Meta-Evaluation Methods Assessment Form

Staff-Activity Detail 1

Steps in Planning and Carrying Out
Inservice Model Activities.

1. Establish and maintain contact with local educational agencies (i.e., pilot schools).
2. Put together instructional packages based on a variety of resources and input.
3. Plan pre- and post-workshop assessment of needs and performance of cooperating teachers.
4. Implement pre-workshop assessment.
5. Implement initial workshop (3-4 days).
6. Implement post-workshop assessment (optional).
7. Conduct on-site supervision in cooperating teachers' classroom.
8. Plan and conduct mini-workshops based on assessment and on-site visits.
9. Carry out final assessment of needs and performance.
10. Analyze assessment data in planning next workshop sequence.

Open-Ended Questionnaire Form

Please respond to the following questions:

1. What are the advantages or positive effects of the planning board and/or detail file?

   planning board:

   detail file:

2. What are the disadvantages or negative effects of the planning board and/or detail file?

   planning board:

   detail file:

3. What are your recommendations for improving the planning board?

4. What are your recommendations for improving the detail file?

Fixed-response Questionnaire Form

Please respond to the following items, keeping in mind the planning board and detail file developed for your component. Indicate the extent of your agreement with each statement by CIRCLING the number related to the response which most closely reflects your feeling.

The planning board and detail file are:	Strongly Agree		Agree	Disagree		Strongly Disagree
1. internally valid. They contain true information about my component	6	5	4	3	2	1
2. externally valid. They can provide true information about other components or projects	6	5	4	3	2	1
3. reliable. They consistently provide accurate data about my component. . .	6	5	4	3	2	1
4. objective. They would contain the same information about my component no matter who developed them	6	5	4	3	2	1
5. relevant. They are appropriate to use in the context of my component. . .	6	5	4	3	2	1
6. important. They give me valuable information	6	5	4	3	2	1
7. scope. They provide a sufficient range of information about my component	6	5	4	3	2	1
8. credible. They give me information that I believe is true	6	5	4	3	2	1
9. timely. They give me information about my component when I need it	6	5	4	3	2	1
10. pervasive. They supply information needed to communicate the nature of my component to many different people	6	5	4	3	2	1
11. cost/effective. They seem to be worth the time, effort, and money invested developing them . . .	6	5	4	3	2	1

Meta-Evaluation Methods Assessment Form

1. Were the evaluation forms clear? _____ Yes _____ No

   Do you have any recommendations for improving their clarity?

2. Were the evaluation forms thorough? _____ Yes _____ No

   Are there any topics that should have been covered that were not included?

3. Do you think that the instruments and the interviews used to assess the planning board and detail file would be appropriate for assessing the other tasks in the documentation and evaluation technology? _____ Yes _____ No

   Do you have any recommendations for this assessment?

A PLANNING BOARD FOR THE INSERVICE COMPONENT

This page was removed prior to its submission to the ERIC Document Reproduction Service due to the small size of print.